DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 477 526 SP 041 599

AUTHOR	van der Aalsvoort, G. M.
TITLE	Different Types of Education: A Means for Diversity in Teaching or a Matter of Situated Teaching Only?
PUB DATE	2003-04-15
NOTE	18p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Classroom Techniques; Early Childhood Education; Elementary Education; Feedback; Foreign Countries; High Risk Students; Interpersonal Communication; Small Group Instruction; *Special Education; *Student Behavior; Student Participation; *Teacher Behavior; *Teacher Student Relationship; *Teaching Methods ; Young Children
IDENTIFIERS	Netherlands; Student Engagement

ABSTRACT

This study examined teachers' and young students' behaviors in the classroom, focusing on at-risk students in four mainstream and eight special institutions in one Dutch city. The study investigated whether there was a relationship between type of institution and teaching methods. Researchers examined quality of interaction, classroom practice, and small group work, identifying processes that elicited effective student participation. Data were collected on teachers from 12 institutions using observation of classroom climate, teacher-student interactions, student persistence, and teacher and student verbal behaviors. Data analysis indicated that teachers in special institutions differed from teachers in mainstream institutions with respect to pedagogical atmosphere in the classroom. Teachers offered more security in special institutions. Verbal behavior differed between types of schools. Teachers from special institutions used more informative feedback during small group work and less neutral feedback than teachers from mainstream schools. There were no differences in student behavior between schools. All students showed high persistence and sufficient orientation toward the teacher in small groups. Teachers controlled the materials presented in 75 percent of mainstream and 50 percent of special settings. (Contains 27 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 477 526

Different types of education: a means for diversity in teaching or a matter of situated teaching only?

G.M. van der Aalsvoort
Leiden University: Department of Special Education
Wassenaarseweg 52
2333 AK Leiden, The Netherlands
Tel. 0031-71-5274073
Fax. 0031-71-5273619
E-mail: aalsvoort@fsw.LeidenUniv.nl.

Abstract

Rating teacher and students' behavior in the classroom was the first level of investigation to study young at-risk students in four mainstream and eight special institutions in one Dutch city. ANOVAS were conducted and they revealed that the teachers from special institutions provided more security than their colleagues in mainstream schools. The second level consisted of analyzing a videotaped small-group task to identify how students' diversity was met during interactions between students and teacher. Informative feedback was more often offered in the mainstream than in the special settings. Finally themes were identified in the discourse and they revealed that the students regardless of type of institute understood setting the rules, negotiating room, and investigating the meaning of the task. It was discussed that a multi method approach is required to make statements on diversity in teaching with young at-risk students to decide whether type of education refers to diversity in teaching or to situated teaching.

The Dutch school system with respect to young children

Caring for young children with various problems and educating them is one of the main concerns of the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science as well as the Ministry of Welfare, Health and Sports in the Netherlands. It is characteristic of the Dutch system that policy decisions are the result of extensive consultations between policymakers at various levels and the organizations within the institutions. Childcare centers and school boards make decisions regarding educational and pedagogical aspects autonomously, not by national or local authorities, and childcare and schools are all financed on an equal footing. Moreover, the Dutch care and education system is based on the principle that special care or education should be started only when regular care fails. Making decisions concerning this is

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G.M. van der Aalsvoort

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

based on the advice of the referral board financed by the Ministries as well as the municipality[1] (Kloprogge, 1998).

Theoretical framework

Transactional model of development

The investigation was embedded in the transactional model in that child development proceeds in interaction with his environment. The model emphasizes the importance of high-quality social interaction between the child and his caregivers to become an effective functioning individual (Riksen-Walraven, 1989; Bronfenbrenner & Ceci, 1994; Smits, 1993). There is no clear endpoint or standard of development towards which the child evolves. To understand what high-quality interaction means, however, a point of view on environment needs to be included both from a theoretical and a methodological point of view.

Situated perspective

The situative perspective offers room to understand the nature of interactions. The main idea in this approach is that teaching and learning should be considered as a situated social practice in which participants gradually become "legitimate participants of the community" (Lave & Wenger 1991). The situative view focuses on practices in which individuals have learned to participate, rather than on knowledge that they have acquired (Greeno, 1998). The view includes more emphasis to social relations in which persons and practices change, reproduce and transform into each other. The main focus in learning is the process of participation and taking over the culture of the community of learners. High-quality social interaction should be studied by investigating the behavior of systems in which individuals participate (Greeno, 1998).

Learning as processes of negotiating meaning

Being together as teacher and student in a task is not sufficient to elicit learning experiences. Teachers take their role according to the setting they work in and they expect from students that they fit into the system and elicit this by implicit task structuring. Students' interactional competence defined as effective participation in the classroom comes forward when they learn to be part of the system (Mehan, 1975, 1979). Patterns in negotiation within a classroom will reveal the processes that are responsible for differentiation between students and teachers as teachers take their role according to the setting they work in.

[1] The study reported here was carried out in 1996 and reported on in 1997 (Van der Aalsvoort & Ruijssenaars, 1997). The findings reported here are a micro-analysis of the small-group data.

How the task is experienced and interpreted by the student is critical for actions and development. This ongoing construction of tasks or contextualizing (Van Oers, 1998) is defined as a semiotic process of negotiations of meanings in which both teacher and student or groups of students are involved by articulating their interpretations of the activity and the actions to be performed.

Processes of contextualization have been identified in studies with young students in special institutions (Van der Aalsvoort & Harinck, 2001). The relationship between teacher expectation on student performance and actual performance in mainstream schools during arithmetic tasks also has been investigated (Van der Aalsvoort, Harinck & Gossé, submitted). Whether students in special institutes are involved in communication cycles that differ from their peers in mainstream education is the object of this study.

Education in regular and special primary schools

There is a tradition of studying either mainstream or special education without actually explaining why a different position has been taken (Skrtic, 1991). Theoretical meta-analyses reveal that these differences may be non-existing with respect to actual practice (Norwich & Lewis, 2000). It may be the case that teaching students with disabilities includes a conviction that the teacher is responsible for these children's development. According to teachers these children will only develop optimally when their environment is specialized to compensate fort the child's lacking abilities.

Huffman and Speer (2000) and Walsh, Tobin and Graue (1993) among others state that students in special institutes actively elicit a specific approach as they still have the proactive motivation to learn. In that case the question is whether the child's interactional competence is being promoted during interactions with the teacher.

Mehan, Hertweck and Meihls (1986) made a significant contribution to this topic by showing that students who were referred to special education were not special students but students who *became* special as institutional practices constructed their identities during meetings with specialists and teachers outside the classroom which then became detached and took a life of its own.

Research questions and methodological considerations

Our study was set out to investigate mainstream and special settings with young children and compare both practices with respect to interaction quality on the level of classroom practice and small-group work. We aimed at identification of processes that would reveal how students' effective participation was elicited.

Thus far the influence of environment has been successfully uncovered on a meso-level by using eco-behavioral analysis to examine associations between classroom-environment and

student behavior to determine the ecological factors that create opportunities for designated child behaviors (Kontos & Keyes, 1999; Kontos, Burchinal, Howes, Wisseh & Galinsky, 2002). The approach, however, does not allow for understanding micro-analytical processes that are responsible for creating opportunities. Within the context of teacher-child interactions analyses should focus on the quality of interactive processes and on qualitative analysis of the strategies used by the participants given their age as they try to understand the goal and the social rules of the task at hand. We therefore set out to combine analyzes with respect to schools as types of education and analyzes that focused upon teacher-child interactions in small groups. The small group investigation included ratings of interaction quality and discourse analyses to come as close as possible to situated understanding of the interactions taking place. Both the perspective of the teacher as a professional and the students taking part in the task as learners was followed and we compared mainstream and special settings. The multiple level approach thus reached allowed us to triangulate the data (Denzin, 1970).

Subjects

Teachers from twelve institutions (child care settings and schools) in the community took part, devoted to mainstream or special care, and either regular or special education of young children. A smaller sample of two care centers from the institutions, as well as a sample of two mainstream elementary schools in the community were selected by asking the Union of Child Care of Leiden to give the names of two of their Union. Children had been referred to special care or special education by formal referral procedures. Table 1 shows the overview of the characteristics of the institutes.

Table 1 about here

Table 1 reveals that the group size is smaller the more complex the developmental difficulties are. The range of group size and age differs markedly between groups. Children from ethnic groups (Turkish, Moroccan and Surinamese) are enrolled in most institutions. The classroom observations refer to one classroom within the institute. The small group findings refer to three students and their teacher during an authentic task carried out in the classroom. The findings with respect to the teachers refer to the twelve participating teachers who were all women. They had worked professionally in the institution for at least two years.

Instruments

The following instruments were used to collect the data.

Classroom level:

- *Observation Rating Scales of Pedagogical Climate* (Van der Aalsvoort & Baltussen, 1994). This instrument consisted of 5 five-point rating scales to rate pedagogical attitude in the classroom as expressed through classroom lay-out, classroom management and during activities. Security (e.g., teacher is responsive to students' signs), Challenge (e.g., teacher expresses expectations of students' management quality), and Well-being (students express feelings of pleasure and commitment) were the three topics to observe and rate from 1 (not observed) to 5 (observed all the time). The mean scores of all sub scales were collected and listed separately.

Small group level

- *Mediation Quality Rating Scales* (Lidz, 1991) was rated from 0 (not observed) to 3 (optimal observed) with respect to the sub scales Task regulation, Praise, and Challenge. The ratings were added and compared between institutes.
- *Reaction to Mediation Quality Rating Scales* (Lidz, 1997) was rated from 0 (no reaction observed) to 5 (optimal reaction observed) with respect to the sub scales Communication with teacher, Using teacher as a source of information in the small group task. The ratings were added and compared between institutes.
- *Persistence of student* (Erickson, Sroufe & Egeland, 1985) was measured by one sub scale of the Competence Scales with a rating from 1 (little) to 7 (strong). The mean rating of the three students in the small group task was used and compared between institutes.
- *Verbal behavior* (Van der Aalsvoort & Ruijssenaars, 1997). The categorization system contained three categories of teacher initiatives, and four categories of teacher replies: Regulative initiative ("Look over here"); Exploratory initiative ("This jigsaw puzzle shows a part of a puppet"); Instruction ("Sort all yellow blocks"); Informative reply ("This is a pencil"); Positive feedback: "You did this very well"; Negative feedback ("This is an incorrect way to throw a marble"); Neutral reply (e.g., repeating the student's reply). Moreover verbal initiatives and replies of students were categorized in either teacher or peer oriented utterances. The number of utterances per category was calculated and compared between the institutes.

Reliability of rating and categorizing

The mean inter-rater reliability of the ratings with respect to the instruments listed before were as follows. Two observers rated two classrooms twice and the comparison of the ratings with Spearman's Correlation Coefficient were: r =. 94 and r =. 99. The ratings of the

videotapes of two institutes were compared with Spearman's Correlation Coefficient and revealed a score of r = .90 and r = .90. Finally two of the protocols were compared with respect to verbal behaviors and showed K = .88 and .99.

Procedure

After having informed the principals and after confirmation of the parental agreement on their child's participation in the small group task, the data collection was started. The institutions were visited three times within two weeks in order to collect all data. Classroom observations took place firstly, followed by a video recording of a small group task. The task was videotaped for a period of 10 minutes. The task was selected by the teacher, and consisted of a regular curriculum activity: reading a book (R/S; PG[2]); participating in a small group game (MI; P-II; SC:PI); work sheet (RE; DN); preschool-arithmetic (BD); language stimulating activity (HI;R/S); observing snails (P-I). The teacher was seated with a group of three students that she had selected, and she was asked to assist these students during the task. She was free to help them in any way she wished.

The quality of social interaction was firstly measured by observing the videotapes with the rating scales after having reached substantial reliability. Then all verbal utterances of the second, the fifth, and the ninth minute of the videotaped session were transcribed and categorized with the categories of Verbal behavior. Finally the transcripts were analyzed with respect to discourse themes.

Results

Findings based on meso-level ratings of classroom and small-group task behavior

Our first research question was whether actual practice of teachers differed between regular and special institutions. Actual practice was expressed in the findings regarding the observation of pedagogical climate in the classroom, and the instruction quality and quality of verbal behavior during the small group task. Developmental appropriateness was derived from the amount of students' Well-being in the classroom, and from reaction to instruction during the small group task. It was expected that the educational quality would meet the needs of the students involved in both regular and special institutes in comparable ways. The findings with respect to classroom level and the small group task are presented in Table 2.

Table 2 about here

---

[2] See Table 1

Table 2 shows that the teachers in the special institutes offered more Security (maximum score = 20) than their colleagues from regular institutions. The amount of Challenge (maximum score = 21), and Mediation quality (maximum score = 9) was comparable between regular and special settings. Table 2 also reveals that student behavior did not differ between settings with respect to Persistence (maximum score = 7), and Reaction to mediation (maximum score = 10). Well-being (maximum score = 7), however, was higher in the regular settings. Thus teachers in special institutions differed from their colleagues from regular institutes offer more security in the classroom than their colleagues from regular institutes. However, students in special institutes express more behavior that refers to feelings of Well-being than their peers from regular institutes.

A second question was whether teachers in special institutions would differ from their colleagues from regular institutes with respect to verbal utterances. Table 3 shows the results with respect to initiatives from the teacher (Regulations; Information; Instruction) and Response (Informative, Positive, Negative or Neutral feedback). The students' utterances are listed as initiatives and responses. These categories are combinations of initiatives or responses towards teacher and peers.

Table 3 about here

Table 3 shows the mean number of verbal initiatives and responses from teachers and students separately. Then number of Verbal initiatives did not differ significantly between regular and special settings with respect to content. Verbal responses, however, differed significantly: informative feedback was found more often in the special settings, whereas neutral feedback was uttered more in the regular settings compared with the special institutions. No differences were found with respect to the number of verbal initiatives and responses from the students.

Findings based on micro-level analyses by analyzing discourse patterns

The second question we had was whether discourse analyses would reveal specific behavioral interaction patterns. We expected to identify how children with difficulties would interact during the task as we expected that they would interact differently compared to their 'normal' developing peers. Both the perspective of the teacher as a professional and the students taking part in the task as learners was followed.

We followed the analysis of Mehan and colleagues and took themes that characterize meaning making as the main focus in learning. We screened the transcripts to identify scripts. We coded a script as such when a student took initiative and introduced an idea about the task at hand. We focused upon scripts that would show students' initiation rights, such as getting to

the floor, holding the floor and introducing news as suggested by Mehan (1979). We expected that these scripts would reveal how teachers responded to student initiatives and approaches. The process of participation and taking over the culture of the community of learners was investigated along the themes: Setting the rules; Negotiating room; Investigating the meaning of the task. The protocols were read again and again and discussed with a colleague. The following excerpts are examples of the themes found.

Setting the rules

We found that the teacher controlled the materials presented in 75% of the mainstream and 50% of the special settings. The students accepted the teacher's role as the person who organizes the task, such as turning the page of the book, taking materials out of boxes, pointing at worksheets etc.. The following two discourse fragments show how rules are set.

Example 1: play group: mainstream setting

The teacher sits close to a small table with a book in front of her. The book contains a story about a mouse having a party. Four children (Mara, Wesley, Tim and Jody) are seated close to the table. The teacher points at the picture in the book and reads: "And then the mouse goes to the…". She looks at Mara: "Look Mara!" Mara looks at her. Wesley exclaims: "Look, he is going to eat candy". Tim points at the picture and brings his hand to his mouth: "Oh!" The teacher continues reading aloud: "The mouse starts eating candy!" "Mmmm", Mara says. She comes closer to the picture: "Mmm", the teacher says. "I like candy too", Wesley says. "Do you like candy too?", the teacher asks Mara. Mara nods.

Example 2: special care setting: physically and intellectually impaired

The teacher sits near a small table with a box of small cards in front of hear. The box contains cards to play Memory. Martijn, Kees and Danoe are sitting close to the table. The teacher says: "We shift the cards first". Martijn and Kees assist her. "Was it enough?" the teacher asks. Martijn and Kees nod. Danoe watches them. The teacher says: "We are putting the cards in neat rows in front of us like so". She sets the example. The children watch her movements and assist her.

Both examples reveal that the teacher's role as the person who organizes the task is a familiar sight to the students. They accept their position tacitly. The examples also show that the students understand the rules regardless of their handicap. The type of setting does not elicit a specific discourse pattern.

Negotiating room

When students take part in a task they will try to locate so-called 'seams' (Mehan, 1979). Seams are moments in the discourse where students try to take the floor by initiating communication with the teacher. We found seams in six settings: 50% in special and 50% in mainstream institutes. The fragments reveal that students took room during the task regardless of the setting. We listed three fragments.

Example 1: Inner city school

The teacher reads a story to Nadira, Hamid and Mohammed. The picture shows a snowman. Hamid exclaims: "I see a snowman!" "Yes", the teacher says. "Yea,.. there.. I already said so". Hamid points at the picture. "Yes", the teacher says, "and he did not melt". "No", Nadira says, he was wearing special clothes". "He was not for real", the teacher says. "Everybody in the story wears special clothes', Nadira says.

Example 2: Special school: behavioral disabilities

Johan, Wesley and Robin are sorting objects according to form. "I want to keep this", Robin says. He keep a spill up "I want to keep that for a beer". The teacher looks at Robin. "For when you are going to drink beer?", she asks. "Yes", Robin says.

Example 3: Special school: pedological institute

Stella, Benjamin and Edwin are playing Memory with words that they learnt during reading lessons. They takes turns in the game including the teacher. Benjamin reads the word on the card he picked up and the teacher follows suit by giving the turn to Edwin. Benjamin says: "Do you know what I did in our holiday? We went to the woods that had a castle in it. That is where we went". The teacher looks at him and says: "That must have been fun! You can talk about that later" She turns to Edwin again who just turned his card. "What does the card say?", she asks. "Read", Edwin says. "Read", Benjamin replies.

The fragments show that students take the floor regardless of the setting they are in. In all cases the teacher receives the initiatives and her response always includes the tacit understanding that she is to decide what will be next.

Investigating the meaning of the task

Regardless of the child's problems with learning or his disability you may expect that he wishes to understand the task at hand. We analyzed the discourse to reveal whether students from special institutes were as actively constructing the meaning of the task as their peers from mainstream settings. We found those in 5 settings: 25% from special and 75% from

mainstream institutes. We listed three examples.

Example 1: Middle class schools

Ivo, Lisa and Judith have worksheets in front of them. They are instructed to color figures on the sheet that refer to understanding spatial positions. "Now you take a colored pencil and you color the dwarf in front of the mushroom ", she says. Ivo and Lisa take a pencil and start coloring. Judith watches Lisa for a few seconds and then starts coloring too. "And do we stop afterwards?", Lisa asks. "No, you may complete the coloring of the dwarf", the teacher says.

Example 2: Special school: behavioral disabilities.

Johan, Wesley and Robin are sorting objects according to form. The teacher introduces the task by pointing at characteristics of the shapes. She keeps a shape up and says to Robin: "Some shapes are…?" "Triangle", Robin says. "Triangle", Wesley repeats. The teacher look surprised. "is this a triangle? Look at it carefully. How many angles can you count?", she asks Wesley. He starts counting: "1, 2, 3, 4". The teacher counts with him"1, 2, 3, 4, a quadrangle", and these are triangles", she says and lifts a triangle to show to Robin. "Quadrangle", Wesley repeats. "Triangle", Robin says. "This one is a triangle", the teachers says. "It has three angles, you see?"

Example 3: Special school: physically impaired

Guido, Marvin and Wolter are seated in their special chairs close to the table. The teacher puts snails on the table. They start moving away. "Teacher?", Marvin asks. The teacher is still busy with preparing the task and she does not reply. He repeats the question three times. Finally she looks up and says: "What's up Marvin?" "At what time the snail is coming out of his house?", he asks. "I don't know", she says. "I do", Marvin says. "Maybe at about 10 o'clock, I don't know", the teacher says. "I know", Marvin says. He repeats this twice while looking at the teacher. "You think about 10 o'clock?", she says then. "At 6 o'clock", he answers.

The three fragments show different ways of pinpointing at the meaning of the task. None of the students' comments or questions are taken for what they are: reasonable questions to become an intentional learner. The fragments not included were statements of the child about the task that were not responded to by the teacher, such as "I will color the hat of the dwarf red".

Discussion

We aimed at visualizing whether a relationship existed between type of institute and approach by observing in the classroom and during a small group task. The results reveal that teachers in special institutions differ from their colleagues from regular institutes with respect to pedagogical atmosphere in the classroom: offering security was higher in the special institutes than in the regular institutions. Moreover, verbal behavior differed between types of education. Teachers from special institutions used more informative feedback during the small group task and less neutral feedback compared with their colleagues from regular institutes. We found no differences in student behavior between the institutes. All children from the sample showed high persistence, and sufficient orientation towards the teacher in the small group (See Table 1), suggesting that the students felt comfortable and well-mediated when took part in the task.

As to communication with respect to social rules and cognitive activities that take place , the results we investigated whether students and teachers in regular settings would communicate differently compared to those in the special institutes. We focused upon scripts that would show how students tried to get a grip on the tacit rules that were expressed during communication sequences. Setting the rules meant that the teacher controlled the materials presented in 75% of the mainstream and 50% of the special settings. Instances that students tried to find seams came forward in six settings: 50% in special and 50% in mainstream institutes. Active construction of the meaning of the task was found in 5 settings: 25% from special and 75% from mainstream institutes. In all students' interactional competence defined as effective participation in the classroom came forward in a limited number of institutes. The protocols of the tasks with the students and their teacher in the schools for intellectually impaired, and the schools for hearing impaired did not reveal any of the signs of active efforts to become involved as part of the system (Mehan, 1975, 1979).

According to Walsh, Tobin, and Graue (1993) preschool teachers have a passion for understanding that children are constructing meaning in their everyday actions. It may be the case that teaching students with disabilities does not appeal to the educational view that these children will only develop optimally when their environment 'takes over', but to the belief that they still have the proactive motivation to learn. This is however not the case with many of the students. The protocols reveal that teacher thinking and teacher acting do not relate.

Method

One could debate on a methodological level whether the social interaction measures in our study were qualified to answer the research questions. The findings suggest that mainstream and special institutions are rather similar, so it could be argued that the instruments were not suitable for measuring the specific interactions that emerge in the case of children with

regular or special needs. We tried to overcome criticisms like those by analyzes through rating scales as well as through discourse analysis to triangulate the data both by combining classroom findings with small group data as well as by small group ratings and discourse analysis (See also Kumpulainen, Van der Aalsvoort & Kronqvist, 2003).

Another point could be made that educational practice should not be measured using a one-time-only measurement. The findings are very similar, however, to the overview of Norwich and Lewis (2000) and those of Mould (1995). The latter describes that the first of five visits in the classroom revealed the highest scores with respect to children's involvement, quality and effectiveness of learning facilitation and attitudinal qualities demonstrated by the teacher. The multi-method approach proved to be suitable for investigating in-depth how interactional competence grows alike in regular and special institutes regardless of child characteristics.

Bibliography

Bronfenbrenner, U., & Ceci, S.J. (1994). Nature-nurture Reconceptualized in Developmental Perspective: A Bio-ecological Model. Psychological Review, 10, 568-586.

Denzin, N.K. (1970). The research act in sociology. A theoretical introduction to methods. London: Butterworths.

Erickson, M.F., Sroufe, L.A., & Egeland, B. (1985). The relationship between quality of attachment and behavior problems in preschool in a high-risk sample, in: I. Bretherton & E. Waters (Eds.), Growing points of attachment theory and research Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 50 (pp. 147-166).

Huffman, L.R., & Speer, P.W. (2000). Academic Performance Among At-Risk Children: The Role of Developmentally Appropriate Practices. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 15, 2, 67-184.

Kloprogge, J. (1998) Early Childhood Education and Child Care in the Netherlands (Utrecht: Report for Unesco).

Kontos, S., & Keyes, L. (1999). An Ecobehavioral Analysis of Early Childhood Classrooms. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 14, 35-50.

Kontos, S., Burchinal, M., Howes, C., Wisseh, S., & Galinsky, E. (2002). An eco-behavioral approach to examining the contextual effects of early childhood classrooms. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 17, 239-258.

Kumpulainen, K., Van der Aalsvoort, G.M., & Kronqvist, E. (2003). Multiple lenses to peer collaboration: Explorations to children's thinking within a situative perspective. Educational and Child Psychology, 20, 2, 80-99.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lidz, C.S. (1991). Practitioner's Guide to Dynamic Assessment. New York: Guilford Press.

Lidz, C.S. (1997). Response to Mediation Scales. Personal Correspondence with the Author.

Mehan, H. (1975). The reality of ethnomethodology. New York: Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Mehan. H. (1979). Learning lessons. Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Mehan, H., Hertweck, A., & Meihls, J.L. (1986). Handicapping the handicapped. Decision making in students' educational careers. Stanford: University Press.

Mould, C. (1995). The Influence of Teacher's Learning Stance on the Effectiveness of the Early Learning of Four Year Olds in Schools in England. Paper presented at Worcester College of Higher Education, September 1995.

Norwich, B., & Lewis, A. (2000). Mapping a pedagogy for special educational needs. Paper presented at the International Special Education Conference in Manchester, 27 July.

Riksen-Walraven, J.M.A. (1989). Meten in perspectief [Measuring in perspective].

Tijdschrift voor Orthopedagogiek, 28, 16-33.

Skrtic, T.M. (1991). The Special Education Paradox: Equity as the Way to Excellence. Harvard Educational Review, 61, 2, 148-207.

Smits, S.C.M. (1993). Pedagogical antecedents of task behavior and school performance. Utrecht: ISOR, dissertation.

Van der Aalsvoort, G.M. (1993). Factors Influencing Competence with Preschoolers and Their Professional Caretakers: Results on Data-Analysis and on Implementation in Senior Secondary Personal and Social Services and Health Care Education. European Childhood Education Research,1, 1, 81-89.

Van der Aalsvoort, G.M. (2002). Different types of education: a means for diversity in teaching? Paper presented at ISCRAT in the symposium 'Cultural, Institutional and Interactional Constructions of a "Handicap"'. ISCRAT, Amsterdam, June 18th

Van der Aalsvoort, D., & Baltussen, M. (1994). Beelden uit de iobk-afdeling [Images from special kindergarten]. Den Bosch: KPC.

Van der Aalsvoort, G.M., & Ruijssenaars, A.J.J.M. (1997). Opvang en begeleiding van jonge kinderen [Care and education of young children at risk in the city of Leiden]. In H.M. Pijnenburg, C.M. van Rijswijk, A.J.J.M. Ruijssenaars & J.W. Veerman (Eds.), Pedologisch jaarboek (pp. 131-143). Delft: Eburon.

Van der Aalsvoort, G.M., & Harinck, F.J.H. (2001). Scaffolding: classroom teaching behavior for use with young students with learning disabilities. Journal of Classroom Interaction, 36, 2, 29-40.

Van der Aalsvoort, G.M., Harinck, F.J.H., & Gossé, G. (Submitted). Reciprocal expectations becoming reality: student-teacher interactions in resolving number fact problems.

Van Oers, B. (1998). From context to contextualizing. Learning and Instruction, 8, 473-488.

Walsh, D.J., Tobin, J.J., & Graue, M.E. (1993). The Interpretative Voice: Qualitative Research in Early Childhood Education. In B. Spodek (Ed.), Handbook of research on the education of young children (pp. 464-476). New York: MacMillan Publishing Company.

Table 1 Overview of the mainstream and special institutes that participated in the study

	Type	Abbreviation used in the text	Group size	Age	Ethnic minorities in the group	Vocational training of teachers
Special Kindergarten: learning problems	Special school	SK	10-12	5-7	Yes	PTTC
Special Kindergarten: behavioral problems	Special school	S/E	8-10	5-7	Yes	PTTC
Special Kindergarten: mental retardation	Special school	MR	8-12	4-7	Yes	PTTC
Special Kindergarten: Hearing impaired/ deaf	Special school	HI	6-8	3-6	Yes	PTTC
Pedological Institute	Special school	PI	8-10	4-7	Yes	PTTC
Special Kindergarten: physically impaired	Special school	OI	6-8	4-7	Yes	PTTC
Special Institute: behavioral problems/family oriented	Special care	SC	4-6	4-7	Yes	SSVE
Special Institute: physically and mentally impaired	Special care	MH	4-6	4-7	Yes	SSVE
Day nursery	Regular care	DN	10-12	2-4	No	SSVE
Play group	Regular care	PP	12-14	2-4	No	SSVE
Inner city primary school	Regular school	R/S	14-16	4-6	Yes	PTTC
Middle class primary school	Regular school	RE	30-36	4-6	No	PTTC

PTTC: Primary Teacher Training College

SSVE: Senior Secondary Vocational Education.

Table 2 Means, standard deviations (in brackets), and F-values of teacher and student measures with respect to social interaction quality in Mainstream and Special Institutes

	Mainstream Institutes: n = 4	Special Institutes: n = 8	F-value (df = 34)
Teachers' behavior:			
- Security	15.3 (1.05)	17.0 (0.61)	41.064 ***
- Challenge	11.0 (1.99)	10.6 (1.69)	0.349
- Mediation quality	4.5 (1.17)	5.3 (1.51)	2.267
Students' behavior:			
- Persistence	6.3 (1.23)	6.1 (1.12)	0.511
- Reaction to mediation	8.3 (2.53)	8.2 (1.61)	0.121
- Well-being	4.2 (0.29)	4.0 (0.19)	8.837**

**p < .01 ***p < .000

Table 3 Means, standard deviations (in brackets), and F-values of verbal behavior categories in Mainstream and Special Institutes.

	Mainstream Institutes: n = 4	Special Institutes: n = 8	F-value (df = 34)
Verbal behavior of teachers			
- Regulation	4.0 (3.05)	6.6 (7.57)	1.318
- Information	23.5 (14.96)	27.3 (8.71)	0.909
- Instruction	33.5 (14.85)	35.5 (9.60)	0.239
- Informative feedback	5.0 (2.22)	8.1 (4.72)	4.688*
- Positive feedback	10.3 (10.81)	8.6 (4.36)	0.417
- Negative feedback	1.8 (2.14)	1.3 (1.67)	0.593
- Neutral feedback	22.8 (11.26)	12.5 (5.23)	14.117**
Verbal behavior of students			
-Initiatives	42.9 (35.98)	41.7 (23.22)	0.106
-Replies	57.1 (35.98)	58.7 (23.27)	-0.139

*p < .05. **p < .01

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE
(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Different types of education: a means for diversity in teaching or a matter of 'what to teach only'?

Author(s): G Mud Oosterwoort

Corporate Source: Leiden University

Publication Date: 15-4-2003

AERA

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, Resources in Education (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following options and sign the release below.

__X__ Check here for Level 1 Release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and other ERIC archival media (e.g. electronic) and paper copy.

or

_____ Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only.

or

_____ Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only.

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

Sign Here, Please

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Signature: G Mud

Position: lecturer ph D

Printed Name: Organization:

Address: Telephone Number: ( )
Date:

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of this document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents which cannot be made available through EDRS).

Publisher/Distributor:

Address:

Price Per Copy: Quantity Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant a reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:

Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

You can send this form and your document to the ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation. They will forward your materials to the appropriate ERIC Clearinghouse.

ERIC Acquisitions
ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation
1129 Shriver Laboratory (Bldg 075)
University of Maryland, College Park
College Park, MD 20742

(800) 464-3742
(301) 405-7449
eric_ae@ericae.net
http://ericae.net